

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17, 19, 21-34, 36, 38-44, 49-62, and 75-77 are pending. Claims 1-3, 6, 11-13, 15, 19, 21, 22, 24, 31-34, 38, 43, and 50-53 have been amended. Claims 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 14, 17, 23, 25-30, 36, 39-42, 44, 49, and 54-62 are original. Claims 75-77 are new. Claims 8, 16, 18, 20, 35, 37, 45-48, and 63-74 have been canceled. No new matter has been introduced by the amendment.

1. Restriction Requirement

The Applicants confirm the election of Group I, claims 1-63. Nonelected claims 64-74 have been canceled.

2. Species Restriction Requirement

The Office requests the Applicants to elect species from each of the following five groups for further examination: Group I (claims 16 and 17), Group II (claims 18 and 19), Group III (claims 20 and 21), Group IV (claims 35-37 and 45-48), and Group V (claims 60 and 63) (Office Action, page 7). The Applicants elect claim 17 in Group I, claim 19 in Group II, claim 21 in Group III, claim 36 in Group IV, and claim 60 in Group V. Nonelected claims 16, 18, 20, 35, 37, 45-48, and 63 have been canceled.

3. Double Patenting

The Examiner asserts that should claim 7 be found allowable, claim 8 will be objected to as being a substantial duplicate thereof (Office Action, page 3). Claim 8 has been canceled. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to claim 8 is moot and should be withdrawn.

4. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1-2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Regarding independent claim 1, the Examiner asserts that the method of crystallization as recited in independent claim 1 is not enabled because the plug-fluids do not mix (Office Action, pages 3-4). Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite “where pressure is applied when introducing each of the first, second and third plug-fluids, thereby resulting in the formation of a plurality of plugs in the first channel, at least one of the plugs comprising the first, second and third plug-fluids”. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection against amended independent claim 1 has been overcome and should be withdrawn. Support for amended independent claim 1 can be found in the Applicants’ specification, for example, in Fig. 17, and in page 83, last paragraph.

Regarding claim 2, the Examiner asserts that the method of crystallization as recited in claim 2 is not enabled because under certain conditions, no mixing between reagents, and therefore no crystallization, will take place in the second channel (Office Action, page 4). The Applicants respectfully submit that crystallization is not a recited limitation in claim 2. For example, the plug fluids from the second channel can merge with the plugs from the first channel to change the condition of crystal growth (merging occurs after crystallization) or the condition of crystallization (merging occurs before crystallization) (see Figs. 12 and 19, page 41, first paragraph, and the paragraph on pages 86-87). Moreover, claim 2 has been amended to recite “also comprising” the steps of claim 2, rather than “further comprising” as recited in original claim 2. In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that the method of crystallization as recited in amended claim 2 is

enabled. Accordingly, the rejection against amended claim 2 has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

5. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-63 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-3, 6, 11-13, 15, 19, 21, 22, 24, 31-34, 38, 43, and 50-53 have been amended to correct various antecedent basis informalities, and to address the rejections. Support for amended claim 3 can be found in the Applicants' specification, for example, in Figs. 49, 53, and 54. Regarding claim 6, solvent can be transferred from one plug to another because the permeability of the solvent in the carrier fluid (see page 13, last full paragraph; and page 89, second paragraph). Claim 16 has been canceled. Regarding claims 40 and 41, as discussed in page 89, second paragraph, the carrier fluid can be permeable to water.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-63 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, the rejections against claims 1-63 have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

6. New Claims 75-77

Claims 75-77 depend from amended independent claims 1 or 3, and thus should be allowable as well. Support for new claim 75 can be found in the Applicants' specification, for example, in Figs. 12 and 19, in page 41, first paragraph, and in the paragraph on pages 86-87. Support for new claims 76 and 77 can be found

Application No. 10/765,718
Amendment in Response to Non-Final Office Action Mailed October 9, 2007
Page 15 of 15

in the Applicants' specification, for example, in Fig. 17, and in page 41, first paragraph.

7. Conclusion

Based on the above amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. The examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned agent to expedite allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 9, 2008

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Yuezhong Feng', is written over a horizontal line.

Yuezhong Feng, Ph.D.
Registration No. 58,657
Agent for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610
(312) 321-4200